



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,476	08/13/2001	Luu Tran	SUN-P6088	9070
32615	7590	10/16/2006	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			POPHAM, JEFFREY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	

DATE MAILED: 10/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/929,476

Applicant(s)

TRAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Popham

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7 and 9-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7 and 9-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 20061012
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Remarks

Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-27 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 7/28/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive (see interview summary). Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made with Lloyd (U.S. Patent 6,219,790) in view of Fishman (U.S. Patent 6,871,236), iPlanet (Sun Microsystems, "iPlanet Portal Server Administrator Guide, Chapter 6 (Managing Authentication)", 5/4/2000, pp. 1-24), and/or Bloomberg (Bloomberg News, "Chips aim to make passwords obsolete", 12/31/1999, pp. 1-3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12, and 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd (U.S. Patent 6,219,790) in view of Fishman (U.S. Patent 6,871,236).

Regarding Claim 1,

Lloyd discloses a client aware authentication system in a wireless network (Column 13, line 61 to Column 14, line 8; whenever wireless is referred to as being in Lloyd, reference is made to this paragraph), comprising:

A plurality of classes of wireless clients, each of the plurality of classes of wireless clients having unique authentication parameters (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, lines 34-40; Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4; and Figure 2);

A wireless server configured to provide a plurality of services to a plurality of classes of wireless clients, wherein one of the plurality of services comprises automatic client type detection logic configured to detect a particular class of a wireless client from the plurality of classes of wireless clients (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; Column 7, lines 55-67; Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4; and Figure 2); and

A plurality of authentication modules, wherein the plurality of authentication modules selectively provide client specific authentication information to authenticate each of the plurality of classes of wireless clients using the unique authentication parameters (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; and Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 23);

But does not disclose that the unique authentication parameters comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a browser

type executing on the wireless client, a version of the browser executing on the wireless client, and a bandwidth of the wireless client.

Fishman, however, discloses a plurality of classes of wireless clients, each of the plurality of classes of wireless clients having unique characteristics (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 29; and Figure 2); and

A wireless server configured to provide a plurality of services to a plurality of classes of wireless clients, wherein one of the plurality of services comprises automatic client type detection logic configured to detect a particular class of a wireless client from the plurality of classes of wireless clients (Column 8, line 34 to Column 9, line 29; and Figure 2);

Wherein the unique authentication parameters comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a browser type executing on the wireless client, a version of the browser executing on the wireless client, and a bandwidth of the wireless client (Column 9, lines 30-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the mobile gateway of Fishman into the authentication system of Lloyd in order to provide customized content to a wide variety of mobile devices on the basis of operating characteristics of the mobile device, such that the content will be transformed so that each device can receive and view the content appropriately (e.g. a cell phone may receive text only versions of content which a laptop computer will receive graphical versions).

Regarding Claim 2,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 1, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the plurality of authentication modules are coupled to an authentication service and wherein the authentication service is for dynamically selecting an authentication service module based on the class of a client (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 23; and Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4).

Regarding Claim 3,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 2, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the authentication service receives and parses client type information of the wireless clients to determine authentication characteristics of the wireless clients (Column 7, lines 41-45).

Regarding Claim 4,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 3, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the plurality of authentication modules comprises a set of predefined authentication parameters used by the wireless server to authenticate the wireless clients with known authentication characteristics accessing the wireless server (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 23; and Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4).

Regarding Claim 5,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 4, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the plurality of authentication modules further comprises authentication parameters dynamically extracted from client type information of the wireless clients accessing the wireless server (Column 7, lines 56-67).

Regarding Claim 27,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 1, in addition, Fishman discloses that a URL is used to determine the plurality of authentication modules presented to each of the plurality of classes of wireless clients (Column 12, lines 15-40).

Regarding Claim 7,

Lloyd discloses a wireless server system comprising:

A plurality of authentication modules each providing respective authentication parameters pertinent to a type of client, wherein the unique authentication parameters are used to authenticate each of a plurality of wireless clients (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4; and Figure 2);

An automatic client detection service for automatically detecting a particular client type from the plurality of wireless clients (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; and Column 7, lines 56-67); and

An authentication service, in response to receiving the particular client type associated with a particular wireless device, for dynamically selecting an authentication module of the plurality of authentication modules based on the particular client type (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4; and Figure 2);

Wherein the authentication service is also for applying a selected authentication module to the particular wireless device for the authentication thereof (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; and Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4);

But does not disclose that the type of client is determined using at least one selected from the group consisting of a browser type executing on the wireless device, a version of the browser executing on the wireless device, and a bandwidth of the wireless device.

Fishman, however, discloses a plurality of classes of wireless clients, each of the plurality of classes of wireless clients having unique characteristics (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 29; and Figure 2); and

A wireless server configured to provide a plurality of services to a plurality of classes of wireless clients, wherein one of the plurality of services comprises automatic client type detection logic configured to detect a particular class of a wireless client from the plurality of classes of wireless clients (Column 8, line 34 to Column 9, line 29; and Figure 2);

Wherein the type of client is determined using at least one selected from the group consisting of a browser type executing on the wireless device, a version of the browser executing on the wireless device, and a bandwidth of the wireless device (Column 9, lines 30-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the mobile gateway of Fishman into the authentication system of Lloyd in order to provide customized content to a wide variety of mobile devices on the basis of operating characteristics of the mobile device, such that the content will be transformed so that each device can receive and view the content appropriately (e.g. a cell phone may receive text only versions of content which a laptop computer will receive graphical versions).

Regarding Claim 9,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 7, in addition, Fishman discloses that the service requests comprise header information which is used to detect the particular client type (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 10).

Regarding Claim 10,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 9, in addition, Fishman discloses that the header information comprises hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) request headers (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 10).

Regarding Claim 11,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 10, in addition, Fishman discloses that the header information comprises programmable user specific headers (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 10).

Regarding Claim 12,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 11, in addition, Fishman discloses that the header information comprises client equipment manufacturer specified headers (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 10).

Regarding Claim 15,

Lloyd discloses a wireless server, comprising:

A client aware authentication logic (Column 6, lines 34-40);

A plurality of client aware authentication modules, wherein the plurality of client aware authentication modules selectively provide client specific authentication information to authenticate each of a plurality of wireless clients using unique authentication parameters (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4; and Figure 2); and

Automatic detection logic configured to detect a particular class of a wireless client from the plurality of wireless clients (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; and Column 7, lines 56-67);

A client data storage module for storing client type information for the particular class of wireless client extracted by the automatic client type detection logic (Column 4, lines 22-47; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; and Column 7, lines 56-67); and

A session service module for storing transient session information for a client requesting authentication to the wireless server (Column 13, lines 1-21);

But does not disclose that the unique authentication parameters comprise at least one selected from the group consisting of a browser type executing on the wireless client, a version of the browser executing on the wireless client, and a bandwidth of the wireless client.

Fishman, however, discloses a plurality of classes of wireless clients, each of the plurality of classes of wireless clients having unique characteristics (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 29; and Figure 2); and

A wireless server configured to provide a plurality of services to a plurality of classes of wireless clients, wherein one of the plurality of services comprises automatic client type detection logic configured to detect a particular class of a wireless client from the plurality of classes of wireless clients (Column 8, line 34 to Column 9, line 29; and Figure 2);

Wherein the unique authentication parameters comprise at least one selected from the group consisting of a browser type executing on the

wireless client, a version of the browser executing on the wireless client, and a bandwidth of the wireless client (Column 9, lines 30-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the mobile gateway of Fishman into the authentication system of Lloyd in order to provide customized content to a wide variety of mobile devices on the basis of operating characteristics of the mobile device, such that the content will be transformed so that each device can receive and view the content appropriately (e.g. a cell phone may receive text only versions of content which a laptop computer will receive graphical versions).

Regarding Claim 16,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the server of claim 15, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the authentication service logic authenticates the client attempting to access the wireless server (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 23).

Regarding Claim 17,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the server of claim 16, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the authentication service logic retrieves client type information from the client data storage module and stores the client type information in the session service module to enable the client to be authenticated by the wireless server (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 23; and Column 13, lines 1-21).

Regarding Claim 18,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the server of claim 17, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the authentication modules comprise a set of predefined authentication parameters for authenticating known classes of wireless clients that access the wireless server (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 23).

Regarding Claim 19,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the server of claim 18, in addition, Fishman discloses that the authentication modules comprise a set of dynamically extracted authentication parameters from service request headers from the wireless clients (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 10).

Regarding Claim 20,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the server of claim 19, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the authentication modules comprise selection logic to selectively choose authentication parameters in response to a client service request (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; and Figure 2).

Regarding Claim 21,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the server of claim 20, in addition, Fishman discloses that the client service request comprises HTTP request headers (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 10).

Regarding Claim 22,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the server of claim 21, in addition, Fishman discloses that the client service request comprises client equipment manufacturer specific headers (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 10).

Regarding Claim 23,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the server of claim 22, in addition, Fishman discloses that the client service request includes programmable user specified headers (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 10).

Regarding Claim 24,

Lloyd discloses a client aware authentication module comprising:

A plurality of client aware characteristics modules, wherein the plurality of client aware characteristics modules provide client specific authentication information in order to authenticate a plurality of wireless clients accessing a wireless server (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4; and Figure 2);

Wherein the wireless server is configured to provide a plurality of services to the plurality of classes of wireless clients, wherein one of the plurality of services comprises automatic client type detection logic configured to detect a particular class of wireless client from the plurality of

wireless clients (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; and Column 7, lines 56-67);

Wherein the client aware authentication module uses unique identification parameters associated with each of the plurality of wireless clients to authenticate each of the plurality of wireless clients and determine which of the plurality of client aware characteristics modules to use (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4; and Figure 2); and

Client aware authentication selection logic (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 23; and Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4);

But does not disclose that the unique identification parameters comprise at least one selected from the group consisting of a browser type, a version of the browser, and a bandwidth.

Fishman, however, discloses a plurality of classes of wireless clients, each of the plurality of classes of wireless clients having unique characteristics (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 29; and Figure 2); and

A wireless server configured to provide a plurality of services to a plurality of classes of wireless clients, wherein one of the plurality of services comprises automatic client type detection logic configured to detect a particular class of a wireless client from the plurality of classes of wireless clients (Column 8, line 34 to Column 9, line 29; and Figure 2);

Wherein the unique identification parameters comprise at least one selected from the group consisting of a browser type, a version of the browser, and a bandwidth (Column 9, lines 30-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the mobile gateway of Fishman into the authentication system of Lloyd in order to provide customized content to a wide variety of mobile devices on the basis of operating characteristics of the mobile device, such that the content will be transformed so that each device can receive and view the content appropriately (e.g. a cell phone may receive text only versions of content which a laptop computer will receive graphical versions).

Regarding Claim 25,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 24, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the plurality of client aware characteristics modules comprise predefined set of client characteristics for authenticating known clients accessing the client aware authentication modules (Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 23; and Column 11, line 55 to Column 12, line 4).

Regarding Claim 26,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 25, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the plurality of client aware characteristics modules comprise client characteristics dynamically extracted from the

client run-time environment (Column 7, lines 56-67); and Fishman discloses that the plurality of client aware characteristics modules comprise client characteristics dynamically extracted from the client run-time environment (Column 8, line 52 to Column 9, line 59).

3. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd in view of Fishman, further in view of iPlanet (Sun Microsystems, "iPlanet Portal Server Administrator Guide, Chapter 6 (Managing Authentication)", 5/4/2000, pp. 1-24).

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 1, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the plurality of authentication modules are presented to each of the plurality of classes of wireless clients (Column 1, line 66 to Column 2, line 28; Column 6, line 34 to Column 7, line 10; and Figure 2); but may not disclose that a URL is used to determine the plurality of authentication modules presented to each of the clients.

iPlanet, however, discloses that a URL is used to determine the plurality of authentication modules presented to each of the clients (Page 3, *How the Users Experience the Authentication Process*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the authentication modules of iPlanet into the authentication system of Lloyd as modified by Fishman in order to give the system the ability to authenticate a broader range of wireless clients via additional authentication/support modules.

Art Unit: 2137

4. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd in view of Fishman, further in view of iPlanet and Bloomberg (Bloomberg News, "Chips aim to make passwords obsolete", 12/31/1999, pp. 1-3).

Regarding Claim 13,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman discloses the system of claim 7, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the plurality of authentication modules comprise:

A user identification module (Column 5, lines 41-64);

A password module (Column 5, lines 41-64);

A secureID module (which is secured) (Column 11, lines 55-64);

and

A Microsoft Windows/NT module (Column 6, lines 34-40);

But does not disclose a membership module, a safeword module, a S/key module, and a nopassword module.

iPlanet, however, discloses a membership module (Pages 1-2; a safeword module (Pages 1-2; and Pages 15-16); and a S/key module (Pages 1-2; and Pages 6-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the authentication modules of iPlanet into the authentication system of Lloyd as modified by Fishman in order to give the system the ability to authenticate a broader range of wireless clients via additional authentication/support modules.

Bloomberg, however, discloses a nopassword module (Pages 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the biometrics system of Bloomberg into the authentication system of Lloyd as modified by Fishman and iPlanet in order to increase security and cut down on the cost of lost passwords.

Regarding Claim 14,

Lloyd as modified by Fishman, iPlanet, and Bloomberg discloses the system of claim 13, in addition, Lloyd discloses that the plurality of authentication modules further comprise a RADIUS authentication module (Column 6, line 65 to Column 6, line 5); and a UNIX authentication module (Column 6, lines 34-40); and iPlanet discloses an LDAP authentication module (Pages 1-2; and Pages 9-11).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2137

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham

Application/Control Number: 09/929,476
Art Unit: 2137

Page 20

Examiner
Art Unit 2137


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER